


RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
APR 24 2006


PTO/SB/21 (08-03)

Approved for use through 08/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10018,319	
	Filing Date	04/25/2002	
	First Named Inventor	Manfred Stefener	
	Art Unit	1746	
	Examiner Name	Crepeau, Jonathan	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	33	Attorney Docket Number	GRUNP17

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC) <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
Remarks		
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT		
Firm or Individual name	IP Strategies Thomas M. Champagne	
Signature		
Date	04/24/2006	

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.		
Typed or printed name	Heather L. Pagella	
Signature		Date 04/24/2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 24 2006

PTO/SB/17 (12-04v2)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Effective on 12/08/2004.
Fees pursuant to the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (H.R. 4818).

FEE TRANSMITTAL

For FY 2005

☐ Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27**TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT** (\$) **500.00****Complete If Known**

Application Number	10/018,319
Filing Date	04/25/2002
First Named Inventor	Manfred Stefener
Examiner Name	Crepeau, Jonathan
Art Unit	1746
Attorney Docket No.	GRUNP17

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)☐ Check ☐ Credit Card ☐ Money Order ☐ None ☐ Other (please identify): _____☒ Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 501998 Deposit Account Name: IP Strategies

For the above-identified deposit account, the Director is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply)

☒ Charge fee(s) indicated below☐ Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee☒ Charge any additional fee(s) or underpayments of fee(s) under 37 CFR 1.16 and 1.17☒ Credit any overpayments**WARNING:** Information on this form may become public. Credit card information should not be included on this form. Provide credit card information and authorization on PTO-2038.**FEE CALCULATION****1. BASIC FILING, SEARCH, AND EXAMINATION FEES**

Application Type	FILING FEES		SEARCH FEES		EXAMINATION FEES		Fees Paid (\$)
	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)	
Utility	300	150	500	250	200	100	
Design	200	100	100	50	130	65	
Plant	200	100	300	150	160	80	
Reissue	300	150	500	250	600	300	
Provisional	200	100	0	0	0	0	

2. EXCESS CLAIM FEES**Fee Description**

Each claim over 20 (including Reissues)

Fee (\$)	Small Entity Fee (\$)
50	25

Each independent claim over 3 (including Reissues)

200	100
-----	-----

Multiple dependent claims

360	180
-----	-----

Total Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)
--------------	--------------	----------	---------------

- 20 or HP =	x	=	
--------------	---	---	--

HP = highest number of total claims paid for, if greater than 20.

Indep. Claims	Extra Claims	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)
---------------	--------------	----------	---------------

- 3 or HP =	x	=	
-------------	---	---	--

HP = highest number of independent claims paid for, if greater than 3.

3. APPLICATION SIZE FEE

If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper (excluding electronically filed sequence or computer listings under 37 CFR 1.52(e)), the application size fee due is \$250 (\$125 for small entity) for each additional 50 sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s).

Total Sheets	Extra Sheets	Number of each additional 50 or fraction thereof	Fee (\$)	Fee Paid (\$)
--------------	--------------	--	----------	---------------

- 100 =	/ 50 =	(round up to a whole number) x	=	
---------	--------	--------------------------------	---	--

4. OTHER FEE(S)

Non-English Specification, \$130 fee (no small entity discount)

Fees Paid (\$)Other (e.g., late filing surcharge): Appeal brief fee**500.00****SUBMITTED BY**

Signature

Registration No.
(Attorney/Agent) 35,478

Telephone 628-263-8600

Name (Print/Type)

Thomas M. Champagne

Date 04/24/2006

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.136. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 30 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**APR 24 2006****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Application No.	Filing Date	First Named Inventor	Atty. Docket No.	Confirmation No.
10/018,319	04/25/2002	Manfred Stefener	GRUNP17	1648
Invention			Examiner	Art Unit
Fuel Cell System and Fuel Cell Therefor.			Crepeau, Jonathan	1746

APPEL BRIEF

Mail Stop ~~FCAD~~
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an Appeal from a final Office Action dated December 2, 2005.

The real party in interest is named on page 2;

Related appeals and interferences are listed on page 3;

Status of the claims is listed on page 4;

Status of amendments is listed on page 5;

Summary of claimed subject matter is presented on page 6;

Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal are presented on page 7;

Arguments begin on page 8;

Claims are listed in Appendix A, beginning on page X;

Evidence is presented in Appendix B, beginning on page X;

Related proceedings are listed in Appendix C, beginning on page X.

04/26/2006 SSITHIB1 00000028 501998 10018319
01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

Application No. 10/018,319

Page 2 of 30

Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006

Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The present application has been assigned to SFC Smart Fuel Cell GmbH, of
Adalbertstrasse 37, D-80799 München, Germany, which is the real party in interest.

Application No. 10/018,319

Page 3 of 30

Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006

Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

To the best of the knowledge and belief of the undersigned, no other appeals or interferences are or have been filed that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 4 of 30

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

This application was submitted on November 13, 2001, with claims 1-99. The following shows the current status of the claims.

1-22. Canceled.

23-29. Rejected.

30-73. Canceled.

74-75. Rejected.

76-99. Canceled.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 5 of 30

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

There have been no amendments filed in this application subsequent to final rejection.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 6 of 30

SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The invention is a system 10, 20 for supplying a consumer with electrical power. The system includes a fuel cell device 11, 21, a fuel tank device 12, 22, and a pump device 14, 24 provided on the consumer side. The fuel cell device generates electrical power. The fuel tank device houses fuel to be supplied to the fuel cell device. The pump device supports a supply of the fuel from the fuel tank device to the fuel cell device. The fuel cell device is provided on the consumer. The fuel tank device is a module that can be inserted into the consumer to supply power and can be removed from the consumer. The fuel is supplied essentially by the pump device.

The reference numerals in the summary indicate elements shown in the exemplary embodiments of Figs. 1 and 2, which show the claimed invention. A complete description of these embodiments is found in the written description in the passage spanning page 16, line 32 through page 20, line 5. The claims also recite aspects of other embodiments disclosed in the written description.

Application No. 10/018,319

Page 7 of 30

Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006

Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Whether claims 23-29, 74, and 75 are unpatentable under 35 USC §103(a) over
Lessing et al. (U.S. Patent 5,641,585).

Application No. 10/018,319

Page 8 of 30

Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006

Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

ARGUMENT

Summary

The claims recites a system for supplying a consumer with electrical power that includes a modular fuel tank device that can be inserted into the consumer to supply power and removed from the consumer, for example, for replacement or refilling. Lessing et al. do not disclose or suggest a modular, replaceable fuel tank, do not provide support for such a fuel tank, and do not acknowledge the advantage provided by such a fuel tank.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 9 of 30

Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) over Lessing et al. (U.S. Patent 5,641,585)

Claim 23

The Claimed Invention

Independent claim 23 recites a system for supplying a consumer with electrical power. The system includes a fuel cell device, a fuel tank device, and a pump device provided on the consumer side. The fuel cell device generates electrical power. The fuel tank device houses fuel to be supplied to the fuel cell device. The pump device supports a supply of the fuel from the fuel tank device to the fuel cell device. The fuel cell device is provided on the consumer. The fuel tank device is a module that can be inserted into the consumer to supply power and can be removed from the consumer. The fuel is supplied essentially by the pump device.

The Examiner's Position

Lessing et al. teach a miniature ceramic fuel cell that is supported on a consumer device such as a mobile telephone. Both the fuel and ambient air are pumped to the fuel cell using pumps. The fuel is contained in a tank that is mounted on the consumer. Lessing et al. do not explicitly teach that the fuel tank is a module that can be inserted into the consumer. However, the invention would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, who would have been motivated to use a removable fuel tank in the Lessing et al. system. It is apparent that the Lessing et al. fuel tank contains a fixed volume of fuel. When the fuel tank is depleted, it would be expedient to be able to replace the fuel tank,

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 10 of 30

and therefore one of skill in the art would have motivation to use a removable fuel tank. Further, it has been held that making integrally-connected elements separable from each other is generally not sufficient to distinguish a claim over the prior art. *In re Dulberg*, 289 F.2d 522, 523, 129 USPQ 348, 349, (CCPA 1961); MPEP 2144.04.

Appellant's Position

In contrast to the claimed invention, Lessing et al. disclose a miniature ceramic fuel cell in which the fuel tank is fixed in place, that is, the fuel tank is not a module that can be inserted into and removed from the consumer. As shown in Fig. 1, the fuel tank 18 is fixed in place with respect to the rest of the power supply system 10 and the consumer (cell phone) 14. Lessing et al. do not disclose or suggest that the fuel tank 18 is a module that is adapted to be inserted into and removed from the consumer 14, as recited in claim 23. Other embodiments of the Lessing et al. fuel cell are shown and described in the reference; none of these embodiments includes a removable fuel tank, and Lessing et al. do not suggest providing a removable fuel tank. In fact, Lessing discloses that the housing of the cell phone completely encloses the components of the power supply, without suggesting that the fuel tank 18 is accessible for removal or replacement. Column 4, lines 37-41.

The examiner acknowledged that the cited reference does not expressly teach that the fuel tank is a module that can be inserted into the consumer, as recited in claim 23. However, the examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an insertable fuel tank in the Lessing et al. device because the artisan

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 11 of 30

would be motivated to do so because it would be expedient to be able to replace the fuel tank when depleted. The examiner further asserted that making integrally-connected elements separable from each other is generally not sufficient to distinguish a claim over the prior art.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness as asserted by the examiner, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP 2143.

Thus, it is respectfully pointed out that recognition by the examiner of a shortcoming of the conventional art that would be solved by an element of the claimed invention does not substitute for disclosing or suggesting that element by Lessing et al. in order to render the claim obvious; the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaack*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). It is improper to use hindsight to reject the claim after determining that the Lessing et al. device could be improved by an innovation of the claimed invention, when Lessing et al. themselves did not recognize the shortcoming or suggest the innovation. "In determining the propriety of the Patent Office case for obviousness in the first instance, it is necessary to ascertain whether or not the reference teachings would appear to be sufficient for one of ordinary skill in the relevant art having the reference before

Application No. 10/018,319

Page 12 of 30

Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006

Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

him to make the proposed substitution, combination, or other modification." *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 1016, 173 USPQ 560, 562 (CCPA 1972).

Further, it is not only the case that Lessing et al. do not indicate that the fuel tank can be exchangeable; Lessing et al. also explicitly exclude an exchangeable fuel tank. With reference to Fig. 1, at column 4, lines 37-41, Lessing et al. state that "[t]he housing surrounding power supply system 10 is depicted as being open so as to reveal the components therein, although in actual use the housing would completely enclose the components of power supply." This enclosure would preclude the use of an exchangeable fuel tank, and thus Lessing et al. teach away from the claimed feature.

Where the court in *In re Dulberg* would not recognize that separability of elements would necessarily be a patentable feature, clearly such a feature would have patentable weight if that feature proved useful to one of skill in the art, such as to overcome a deficiency in the prior art. It is submitted that making integrally-connected elements separable from each other in this case is an inventive step, and not a mere design choice. In his rejection, the examiner recognized the utility of a modular, replaceable fuel tank. Many difficulties are encountered in providing such a replaceable fuel tank, none of which was addressed by Lessing et al. For example, any useful fuel for fuel cells inherently has dangerous properties. Among these are flammability (a property, for example, of hydrogen, methanol, butane), the ability to form explosive mixtures easily with air (hydrogen), and toxicity of the fuel (for example, methanol). As a result, an exchangeable fuel tank module that is to be handled by a consumer, which must be transported by different means of transportation in commerce, requires overcoming

Application No. 10/018,319

Page 13 of 30

Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006

Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

enormous difficulties regarding matters of safety, regulatory compliance, and consumer protection.

Lessing et al. did not address these difficulties, and therefore did not contemplate or suggest a replaceable fuel tank, and it follows that Lessing et al. did not provide a suggestion to one of skill in the art to include a replaceable fuel tank in their design or how one might do so. Absent this suggestion, one of skill in the art might recognize on his or her own that a replaceable fuel tank would be beneficial, but would be left with the task of providing the replaceable fuel tank, and overcoming the noted difficulties. In order to avoid the noted difficulties, one of skill in the art would have to be satisfied with the concept proposed by Lessing et al., that is, a device having a fixed fuel tank.

An analogous example would be the fuel tank of an automobile. In this example, the fuel tank is typically fixed onboard the vehicle and can only be refueled using specially designated, professionally-built and serviced refueling stations. No one would fairly assert that one of skill in the art would find suggestion in the design of a conventional automobile that a replaceable fuel tank could easily be provided, even though one of skill in the art might believe that a replaceable fuel tank might provide some advantage. As in the case of the claimed invention, one of skill in the art could imagine that such a feature would be an improvement over the conventional design, but is not put in possession of the improvement by disclosure of the conventional design. Thus, the claimed invention, which features a functional replaceable fuel tank as part of the design, is inventive, just as it would take an inventive step to provide a replaceable fuel tank for an automobile.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 14 of 30

Further, providing a fuel tank module that can be inserted and removed requires overcoming significant technical challenges regarding the mechanical design, including provision of a mechanical retention mechanism, an ejection mechanism, a leak-tight fluid connection mechanism, and, in some cases, electrical interfaces. None of these factors is addressed by Lessing et al., whereas the claimed invention provides a working design. In addition, an exchangeable fuel cartridge requires a special housing design that allows access to the exchangeable fuel tank module, for example, by means of a lid that can be opened. As noted above, this requirement is not only overlooked by Lessing et al., that reference also explicitly discloses a housing that completely encloses the components of the power supply, including the fuel tank.

Numerous other factors must be addressed when providing a replaceable fuel tank, none of which was addressed by Lessing et al., making the Lessing et al. design unsuitable for use with a replaceable fuel tank. For example:

1. A fuel level sensor is typically used in fixed tanks but typically cannot be used for replaceable tanks, and there are additional difficulties associated with mobile devices, which must work in any orientation. Lessing et al. do not address this, and would leave a user unable to determine whether the exchangeable fuel tank is empty.

2. Not every pump is self-priming, and fuel cell systems are typically destroyed when air replaces fuel. Lessing et al. provide no means to protect the fuel pump and the rest of the system from making contact with air.

3. Lessing et al. make no provision for gaining access to the empty fuel tank.

Specially designed housing and replacement mechanisms need to be provided.

Application No. 10/018,319

Page 15 of 30

Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006

Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

4. Lessing et al. make no provision for protecting uncovered interfaces against dirt, dust, misuse, etc.

5. Lessing et al. do not address disposal of the empty fuel tank, which will contain dangerous residual amounts of fuel, or for managing the waste streams associated with the large number of these devices that would be in use.

6. Lessing et al. provide no means for inserting the new tank module, or for the device to determine or provide an indication that a full tank module has been inserted.

7. Other questions that are not addressed or answered by Lessing et al. include:

- Where do you get a new tank module?
- How do you transport the new tank module in light of the dangerous properties of any fuel?
- How is the dealer/retailer supplied with such tank modules?
- Is he/she allowed to store useful quantities?
- Are all regulations met?
- How do you make sure that the fuel cartridge and system are compatible to avoid unauthorized fuel cartridges to be coupled to the fuel cell system?

These questions and the factors noted above clearly highlight that one of skill in the art would not be able to use an exchangeable fuel tank with the Lessing et al. device absent a great deal of experimentation and modification rising to the level of inventive effort. While one of skill in the art might recognize that such improvement over the Lessing et al. design would be beneficial, and might be internally motivated by that potential benefit, Lessing et al. do not supply even the suggestion for such inventive

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 16 of 30

effort, and the examiner has not provided the teaching necessary to take that inventive step.

The examiner mentioned several other references as representing the state of the art, and as disclosing removable fuel tanks. However, the noted references do not disclose fuel cells or fuel tanks that are compatible with the teachings of Lessing et al. That is, none of the noted references overcomes the deficiencies of Lessing et al. noted above, nor do the references or the examiner disclose how the teachings of these additional references can be applied to the teachings of Lessing et al. such that the Lessing et al. fuel tank could be made removable and replaceable. Obviousness does not require absolute predictability with regard to success in the combination of teachings of references, but at least some degree of predictability is required. At least some evidence of a reasonable expectation of success is needed to support a conclusion of obviousness. *In re Rinehart*, 531 F.2d 1048, 189 USPQ 143 (CCPA 1976).

It should also be noted that the examiner did not base the rejection in part on these additional references, and that all of these additional references issued after Applicant's claimed priority date, and therefore cannot be fairly considered to represent the state of the art with respect to the claimed invention.

For at least the reasons noted above, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 17 of 30

Claim 24**The Claimed Invention**

Claim 24 recites the system of claim 23, in which the pump device can be adjusted such that a quantity of fuel supplied by the pump device of the fuel cell device effects a constant output of the fuel cell device, such that the output of the fuel cell device serves as output quantity.

The Examiner's Position

The Lessing et al. pumps are capable of being controlled in the claimed manner.

Appellant's Position

Lessing et al. do not disclose or suggest this feature, and the examiner offers no specific example by which Lessing et al. render obvious the claimed feature. In addition, the argument with respect to claim 23 is incorporated herein in its entirety as being applicable to claim 24, which depends from claim 23. The rejection, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 18 of 30

Claim 25

The Claimed Invention

Claim 25 recites the system of claim 23, in which the fuel cell device is designed as a hydrogen fuel cell device.

The Examiner's Position

The Lessing et al. fuel cell is operable on hydrogen.

Appellant's Position

The argument with respect to claim 23 is incorporated herein in its entirety as being applicable to claim 25, which depends from claim 23. The rejection, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 19 of 30

Claim 26**The Claimed Invention**

Claim 26 recites the system of claim 23, further comprising a pump device provided on the consumer side, for supporting a supply of the oxidising agent to the fuel cell device.

The Examiner's Position

The examiner did not express a particular position with respect to this claim.

Appellant's Position

It is not clear whether Lessing et al. provide or suggest a pump device on the consumer side, and the examiner offers no specific example by which Lessing et al. disclose or suggest this feature. In addition, the argument with respect to claim 23 is incorporated herein in its entirety as being applicable to claim 26, which depends from claim 23. The rejection, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 20 of 30.

Claim 27**The Claimed Invention**

Claim 27 recites the system of claim 26, in which the supply of the oxidising agent is essentially supplied by the pump device.

The Examiner's Position

The examiner did not express a particular position with respect to this claim.

Appellant's Position

It is not clear whether Lessing et al. provide or suggest an oxidizing agent by a pump device on the consumer side, and the examiner offers no specific example by which Lessing et al. disclose or suggest this feature. In addition, the arguments with respect to claims 23 and 26 are incorporated herein in their entireties as being applicable to claim 27, which depends from claims 23 and 26. The rejection, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 21 of 30

Claim 28**The Claimed Invention**

Claim 28 recites the system of claim 26, in which the pump device can be adjusted such that the quantity of oxidising agent supplied by the pump device of the fuel cell device effects a constant output of the fuel cell device, such that the output of the fuel cell device serves as an output quantity.

The Examiner's Position

The Lessing et al. pumps are capable of being controlled in the claimed manner.

Appellant's Position

Lessing et al. do not disclose or suggest the pump adjustment feature, and the examiner offers no specific example by which Lessing et al. render obvious the claimed feature. Further, it is not clear whether Lessing et al. provide or suggest a pump device on the consumer side, as recited in claim 26, and the examiner offers no specific example by which Lessing et al. disclose or suggest this feature. In addition, the arguments with respect to claims 23 and 26 are incorporated herein in their entireties as being applicable to claim 27, which depends from claims 23 and 26. The rejection, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 22 of 30

Claim 29**The Claimed Invention**

Claim 29 recites the system of claim 26, in which the pump device is designed as a ventilator device for supplying atmospheric air from the environment.

The Examiner's Position

The examiner did not express a particular position with respect to this claim.

Appellant's Position

Lessing et al. do not disclose or suggest a pump that is designed as a ventilator device, and the examiner offers no specific example by which Lessing et al. render obvious the claimed feature. Further, it is not clear whether Lessing et al. provide or suggest a pump device on the consumer side, as recited in claim 26, and the examiner offers no specific example by which Lessing et al. disclose or suggest this feature. In addition, the arguments with respect to claims 23 and 26 are incorporated herein in their entireties as being applicable to claim 27, which depends from claims 23 and 26. The rejection, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 23 of 30

Claim 74**The Claimed Invention**

Claim 74 recites the system of claim 23, in which the pump device can be adjusted such that a quantity of fuel supplied by the pump device of the fuel cell device effects a constant output of the fuel cell device, such that the output of the fuel cell device serves as output quantity.

The Examiner's Position

The Lessing et al. pumps are capable of being controlled in the claimed manner.

Appellant's Position

Lessing et al. do not disclose or suggest this feature, and the examiner offers no specific example by which Lessing et al. render obvious the claimed feature. In addition, the argument with respect to claim 23 is incorporated herein in its entirety as being applicable to claim 74, which depends from claim 23. The rejection, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 24 of 30

Claim 75

The Claimed Invention

Claim 75 recites the system of claim 27, in which the pump device can be adjusted such that the quantity of oxidising agent supplied by the pump device of the fuel cell device effects a constant output of the fuel cell device, such that the output of the fuel cell device serves as an output quantity.

The Examiner's Position

The Lessing et al. pumps are capable of being controlled in the claimed manner.

Appellant's Position

Lessing et al. do not disclose or suggest this feature, and the examiner offers no specific example by which Lessing et al. render obvious the claimed feature. Further, it is not clear whether Lessing et al. provide or suggest an oxidizing agent by a pump device on the consumer side, as recited in claim 27, and the examiner offers no specific example by which Lessing et al. disclose or suggest this feature. In addition, the arguments with respect to claims 23, 26, and 27 are incorporated herein in their entireties as being applicable to claim 75, which depends from claims 23, 26, and 27. The rejection, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 25 of 30

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all rejections have been overcome. It is therefore requested that the Amendment be entered, the claims allowed, and the case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

April 24, 2006

Date

TMC:hlp



Thomas M. Champagne
Registration No. 36,478
Customer No. 49691
828.253.8600
828.253.8620 fax

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 26 of 30

APPENDIX A

CLAIMS

23. A system for supplying a consumer with electrical power, comprising:
a fuel cell device for generating electrical power,
a fuel tank device for housing fuel to be supplied to the fuel cell device, and
a pump device provided on the consumer side, for supporting a supply of the fuel
from the fuel tank device to the fuel cell device,
characterised in that the fuel cell device is provided on the consumer and the fuel
tank device is a module that can be inserted into the consumer to supply power and
removed from the consumer,
wherein the fuel is supplied essentially by the pump device.

24. A system as claimed in Claim 23, in which the pump device can be
adjusted such that a quantity of fuel supplied by the pump device of the fuel cell device
effects a constant output of the fuel cell device, such that the output of the fuel cell device
serves as output quantity.

25. A system as claimed in Claim 23, in which the fuel cell device is designed
as a hydrogen fuel cell device.

Application No. 10/018,319
Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006
Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

Page 27 of 30

26. A system as claimed in Claim 23, further comprising a pump device provided on the consumer side, for supporting a supply of the oxidising agent to the fuel cell device.

27. A system as claimed in Claim 26, in which the supply of the oxidising agent is essentially supplied by the pump device.

28. A system as claimed in Claim 26, in which the pump device can be adjusted such that the quantity of oxidising agent supplied by the pump device of the fuel cell device effects a constant output of the fuel cell device, such that the output of the fuel cell device serves as an output quantity.

29. A system as claimed in Claim 26, in which the pump device is designed as a ventilator device for supplying atmospheric air from the environment.

74. A system as claimed in Claim 23, in which the pump device can be adjusted such that a quantity of fuel supplied by the pump device of the fuel cell device effects a constant output of the fuel cell device, such that the output of the fuel cell device serves as output quantity.

75. A system as claimed in Claim 27, in which the pump device can be adjusted such that the quantity of oxidising agent supplied by the pump device of the fuel

Application No. 10/018,319

Page 28 of 30

Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006

Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

cell device effects a constant output of the fuel cell device, such that the output of the fuel cell device serves as an output quantity.

Application No. 10/018,319

Page 29 of 30

Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006

Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

APPENDIX B

EVIDENCE

None.

Application No. 10/018,319

Page 30 of 30

Appeal Brief dated April 24, 2006

Reply to final Office action of December 2, 2005

APPENDIX C

RELATED PROCEEDINGS

None.